REMARKS

Claims 2, 6-9, and 21-50 are pending in this Application. Claims 1, 3-5, and 10-20 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. Claims 21-50 are newly added to further clarify the claimed invention in accordance with the current policies of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. The applicant appreciates the examiner's allowance of claims 2 and 6-9.

The Office action mailed 8 November 2000 (Paper No. 7) provided by the examiner has been read and given careful consideration.

On page 2 of Paper No. 7, the examiner rejects claims 1, 3-5, and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,608,418 issued to McNally. The applicant has cancelled claims 1, 3-5, and 10-20 without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. Claims 21-50 have been newly added to further clarify the claimed invention. The applicant respectfully believes that newly added claims 21-50 are not anticipated by McNally '418, for the reasons set forth below.

There is no anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 unless all of the elements in a claim are found in exactly the same situation and united in the same way in a single prior art reference, and thus every element must be literally present and must also be arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (CAFC 1989). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d

1382, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970), and the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.) § 2143.03. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, absence from the reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565, 230 USPQ2d 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986). See also M.P.E.P. § 2131 and 35 U.S.C. § 102.

McNally '418 describes a computer system that can be coupled to two different types of display monitors. The McNally '418 device can be coupled to either a cathode ray tube or a flat panel display, for example. McNally '418 states that existing application programs do not need to be modified for either type of display because of the disclosed graphics subsystem which is compatible with both a cathode ray tube and a flat panel display. In column 1 at lines 50-58, McNally '418 describes the problems that the McNally '418 device is designed to solve. "Existing high resolution computer graphics systems typically require major modifications to the graphics subsystem to accommodate the lower resolution flat panel displays....Such modifications increase the cost of developing smaller and lighter weight computer graphics systems."

McNally '418 does not describe connecting a video display unit to a computer system after the computer system has been powered on.

In the newly added claims 21-50, the independent claims are 21, 26, 31, 36, and 43. Each of these independent claims clearly sets forth that a video display unit is connected to a computer system **after** the computer system has been powered on. McNally '418 does not expressly or inherently describe that feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 21 sets forth "connecting a video display unit to a computer system after said computer system has been powered on and initialized". Claim 26 sets forth "connecting a video display unit to a computer system after said computer system has been initialized and while said computer system is being operated by a user".

Claim 31 sets forth "connecting a video display unit to a computer system after said powering on of said computer system". Claim 36 sets forth "said video display unit being connected to said computer system after said computer system has been powered on and initialized". Claim 43 sets forth "said video display unit being connected to said computer system after said computer system has been booted".

McNally '418 fails to describe connecting a video display unit to a computer system after the computer system has been powered on, as set forth in independent claims 21, 26, 31, 36, and 43. McNally '418 does not teach each and every element of independent claims 21, 26, 31, 36, and 43. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 26, 31, 36, and 43 are not anticipated by McNally '418.

If an independent claim is not anticipated by a particular reference, then any claim depending from that independent claim is also not anticipated by the particular reference. This is true because the claims depending from that independent claim necessarily incorporate all limitations set forth in that independent claim. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner allow all claims 21-50.

Numerous references were cited by the examiner but not utilized in the rejection of the claims. As recognized by the examiner, these references fail to teach or suggest the specifically recited features of the present invention and accordingly, no further comment on these references is necessary.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and early issuance thereof is solicited. Should any questions remain unresolved, the examiner is requested to telephone applicant's attorney.

A fee of $340.00 is incurred by the addition of two (2) independent claims in excess of total 8 and ten (10) in excess of total 20. Applicant's check drawn to the order of Commissioner accompanies this Amendment. Should the check become lost, or should other fees be incurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P55394
Date: 2/7/01
I.D.: REB/DC